

S/N: 10/607,020

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-41 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 22, and 32 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 4, 2007, the specification and Claim 12 were objected to. Furthermore, Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16-23, 25-27, 30-36, and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and Claims 8-9, 14-15, 24, 28-29, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-41 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 19, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

**II. Objection to the Specification**

In the Office Action dated January 4, 2007, the Examiner objected to the specification as containing an informality. The specification has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

S/N: 10/607,020

### III. Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 12 as containing an informality. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Claim 12 recites "a date selection control" prior to reciting "a date from the date selection control." Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is improper.

### IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16-23, 25-27, 30-36, and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,236 ("*Pivowar*"). Claims 1, 22, and 32 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the view data object indicating a view mode corresponding to the first selected calendar" and "displaying each selected calendar ... in the view mode indicated by the passed view data object." Amended Claims 22 and 32 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 14, lines 22-30.

In contrast, *Pivowar* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Pivowar* merely discloses that identification data sets include a system name (e.g. CAL0, CAL1, CAL2, etc.), a username (e.g. Willie Mills, Dave Davies, etc.), and a plurality of attributes. (See col. 6, lines 27-30.) Such attributes in *Pivowar* may indicate that a calendar is selected, a primary calendar (default), read only, or a foreign calendar. (See col. 6, lines 30-32.) *Pivowar*'s attributes may be selectively determined

S/N: 10/607,020

by a user or automatically assigned depending on an associated calendar's source. (See col. 6, lines 32-35.) Furthermore, FIG. 9B in *Pivowar* shows a pair of calendars displayed simultaneously in a side-by-side relationship and each divided into hourly increments. (See col. 8, lines 20-22.) Time increment icon 140, which corresponds to hour increments, is enlarged because multiple calendars are displayed in FIG. 9B. (See col. 8, lines 22-25.) A time duration bar 900 is included for indicating a time period during which a scheduled matter is arranged. (See col. 8, lines 25-26.) In *Pivowar*, attributes may be selectively determined by a user or automatically assigned depending on an associated calendar's source. Nowhere in *Pivowar* does it disclose a view data object indicating a view mode corresponding to a selected calendar. Accordingly, *Pivowar* does not disclose displaying selected calendars in a view mode indicated by a view data object.

*Pivowar* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Pivowar* at least does not disclose "the view data object indicating a view mode corresponding to the first selected calendar" and "displaying each selected calendar ... in the view mode indicated by the passed view data object," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 22 and 32 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 22, and 32 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 22, and 32.

Dependent Claims 2-21, 23-31, and 33-41 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 22, and 32, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 22, and 32. Accordingly,

S/N: 10/607,020

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-21, 23-31, and 33-41.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: April 3, 2007

DKS:mdc



D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE